



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,167	01/30/2004	Akira Miura	042054	4743
38834	7590	11/14/2007	EXAMINER	
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP			REAMES, MATTHEW L	
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 700			2891	
WASHINGTON, DC 20036			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/767,167	MIURA ET AL.	
	Examiner Matthew L. Reames	Art Unit 2891	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1,2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by IBM Technical disclosure (NB8910242) in view of Sugino (Applicant's Admitted Prior Art) as evidenced by Mandelman (US 5629580).

a. As to claim 1 and 2, NB8910242 teaches the use of a gated field emission devices (FEDs) in an integrated circuit instead of FETs (see disclosure). Mandelman clarifies that FEDs are indeed fine vacuum tubes (see column 1 lines 10-25). The IBM technical disclosure does not teach a semiconductor substrate.

Sugino teaches forming such device on a silicon (semiconductor) substrate.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have formed the devices of IBM technical disclosure integrated circuit on a silicon substrate or to form FEDs in conjunction with integrated circuit on silicon substrates.

One would have been so motivated for faster switching speed of a FED.

b. As to claim 7, NB8910242 teaches a thermionic cathode.

3. Claims 3-6,8,9,10,11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peczalski (US 4991920) in view of (NB 8910242)/Sugino in further view of Mandelman.

a. As to claim 3-6, Peczalski teaches a A/D converter using a Mach-Zender interferometer (see column 3 lines 50-70). Peczalski further teaches amplifier which will use transistors (see item 86). Examiner is interpreting the device of Peczalski to be a high speed communication device, since information is contained in the light, as well as electric field sensor since it detects light. Further Pecczalski teaches laser (solid state devices) (see e.g. figs. and column 2 last paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have replace the FETs of Peczalski with the FEDs of (NB 8910242).

One would have been so motivated in order to have faster switching speed and radiation insensitivity as taught by Mandelman (see column 1 lines 10-25).

4. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over NB (8910242)/Sugino as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Dai et al. (US 20010019238).

a. As to claim 8, neither NB8910242 nor Pwczalski teach the use of a carbon nanotube.

However carbon nanotube FEDs were well known in the art, further carbon nanotubes can be mass produced (see Dai abstract).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used a carbon nanotube gated FED.

One would have been so motivated since they were standard in the art would have provided a cost benefit.

5. Claims 3-6,8,9,10,11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C: 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soref (US 5,838,870) in view of (NB 8910242)/Sugino in further view of Mandelman.

a. As to claim 3-6,9,10,11 Soref teaches a A/D converter using a Mach-Zender interferometer (see column 3). Soref further teaches FET (see column 4). Examiner is interpreting the device of Soref to be a high speed communication device, since information is contained in the light, as well as electric field sensor since it detects light. Further Soref teaches laser (solid state devices) (see e.g. figs.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have replace the FETs of Soref with the FEDs of (NB 8910242) on the silicon substrate of Soref.

One would have been so motivated in order to have faster switching speed and radiation insensitivity as taught by Mandelman (see column 1 lines 10-25).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew L. Reames whose telephone number is (571)272-2408. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 6:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, B. William Baumeister can be reached on (571)272-1722. The fax phone

Application/Control Number:
10/767,167
Art Unit: 2891

Page 6

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MLR

Matthew C. Landay
Matthew C. Landay
Primary Examiner